

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 09/409,242                              | 09/30/1999     | RAHUL R. VAID        | 61582-00001USPT 5090 |                 |
| 7.                                      | 590 02/26/2003 |                      |                      |                 |
| Gary B. Solomon                         |                |                      | EXAMINER             |                 |
| Jenkens & Gilchrist P. C.<br>Suite 3200 |                |                      | MORGAN, ROBERT W     |                 |
| 1445 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75202-2799  |                |                      | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER    |
| Dallas, 1A 75                           | 202-2177       |                      | 3626                 |                 |

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | pplicant(s)   | 1  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/409,242  | VAID, RAHUL R.  |  |  |  |  |
| Autisory Action   | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Robert W. Morgan  | 3626  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o   | correspondence addres   | is t-  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 3 Feburary 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this application in a section () a timely filed amendment whi   | cation. A proper reply<br>ich places the applicat   | to a<br>ion in                                   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe consumer on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | of the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See 136(a) and the appropriate extens the final Office action; or (2) | MPEP  tension fee sion fee under as set forth in |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (  | (see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |  |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b   | pelow);   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) M they present additional claims without cancel   | ing a corresponding number of   | finally rejected claims   |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | tion(s):  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a s  | separate, timely filed a  | mendment   |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se   |   | sidered but does NOT  | place the  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | cause it is not directed SOLELY   | to issues which were  | newly  |  |  |  |
|   | For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.         |   |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: NONE.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: NONE.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-16 and 34-49.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 17-33.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is  | a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap   | proved by the Examin  | er.  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).   | <del></del>   |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  | JOSEPH THOM<br>SUPERVISORY PATENT   | AS PLAMINER   |  |  |  |  |
| S Patent and Trademark Office   | ALECAMOFOCA CEM   | THI OCO.  | <del></del>                                      |  |  |  |

## Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 009/409,242



Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitations of "...to be utilized by... and operable to be utilized by the customer to book a flight...." in claims 1, 34 and 44, change the scope of the claim as previously filed and required further search and reconsideration. In particular, Applicant's proposed amendment now narrows "the identifier" as the mechanism "operable to be utilized by the customer to book a flight". Such a change is a significant shift in the scope of the claim, as "the identifier" in previous claims never recited nor required such functionality. As such, these limitations require futher search and consider.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's remarks appear to rely on features which have not been entered as of the present communication. Thus, the finality of the previous Office Action is maintained.